DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 323 548 CS 212 503

AUTHOR Fear, Kathleen L.
TITLE Differences in Teacher Conceptions Related to Practices in Writing Instruction.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 52p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Education; Process Education; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Expectations of Students; *Teacher Role; Writing Evaluation; Writing Instruction; Writing Skills; *Writing Teachers
IDENTIFIERS Teaching Perspectives; Writing Development

ABSTRACT

A study examined the relationship between teacher's conceptions and practices during writing instruction. A pool of 27 third-, fourth-, and fifth-grade teachers completed structured questionnaires on their conceptions about writing instruction. From the original pool, 10 subjects were chosen because they held the most disparate conceptions about writing instruction. Five teachers were identified with a strong externally focused perspective in which the teacher's role is to inform students about and evaluate students' production of language forms. Five teachers with an internally focused perspective expressed high agreement with the conception that the student informs the teacher about and self-evaluates the function of a written piece. Data were gathered through interviews with the subjects and a four-month classroom observation. Results indicated that significant differences existed between the two groups of teachers in their conceptions of student informancy status, goals, and evaluation during writing instruction. Results also revealed significant differences in the teachers' classroom practices that were positively related to differences in conceptions about writing instruction. (Four tables of data are included; 20 references and 4 appendixes containing a conceptions questionnaire, teacher interview form, observational guidelines, and rating scale analysis are attached.) (KEH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED323548

Differences in Teacher Conceptions Related to Practices in Writing Instruction

Kathleen L. Fear

Albion College

Running head: Teacher Conceptions and Practices in Writing

CS212503

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kathleen L. Fear

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Differences in Teacher Conceptions Related to Practices in Writing Instruction

Abstract

This study examined the relationship between teachers' conceptions and practices during writing instruction. Teachers (n=27) completed structured questionnaires on their conceptions about writing instruction. After analyzing the data from the questionnaire, ten teachers holding two disparate perspectives were identified for more indepth analysis. Teachers with an externally-focused perspective expressed high agreement with the conception that the teacher's role is to inform students about and evaluate students' production of language forms. Teachers with an internally-focused perspective expressed high agreement with the conception that the student informs the teacher about and self-evaluates the function of a written piece. Results indicated that significant differences existed between the two groups of teachers in their conceptions of student informancy status, goals and evaluation during writing instruction. Although teachers were involved in the same implementations, used the same terminology, and reported that they were teaching process writing for approximately the same amount of time, significant differences were found in teachers' classroom practices that were positively related to differences in conceptions about writing instruction.

Teacher Conceptions about Writing

This study was conducted as a follow-up to two writing reform initiatives that were conducted in the same school

district: 1) a three-year research project, (Englert, Raphael, Anderson, Anthony, Fear & Gregg, 1986) and 2) a district-wide inservice effort focusing on process writing. The purpose was to analyze differences in teachers' conceptions about writing and their instructional practice after two years of intensive writing reform efforts. Examining teacher conceptions about subject matter is emphasized as an important source of information for investigating instructional effects (Shulman, 1986). Recently, researchers examine teacher thinking within subject matter domains (McDermaid, Ball & Anderson, 1987; Wilson & Wineburg, 1987; and Ball, 1988). For example, reading researchers are beginning to study the effects of teacher thinking and practices in reading instruction: Duffy, Roehler, Sivan, Rackliffe, Book, Meloth, Vavrus, Wesselman & Putnam (1987)). Similarly, teacher thinking about math was studied by Peterson, Fennama, Carpenter & Loef (1988). Math researchers found that teachers' who hold more cognitively-based perspectives viewed the teacher and the learner as actively engaged with one another in construction of mathematical knowledge and understanding and this perspective was related to student achievement in math. In the present study a similar concern is reflected, but the focus is on identifying teacher conceptions in the area of writing instruction.

In order to explain differences in teacher thinking about writing instruction, two perspectives (externally-focused and internally-focused) were identified from the literature. Marked similarities across the writings of literacy theorists summarized

by Eagleton (1983) and Cherryholmes (1988), research on writing instruction (Tierney, Leys, and Rogers, 1984; Deford, 1984; and Raphael, Englert & Anderson, 1987), and models of school writing and literacy instruction proposed by Britton (1975) and Scardamalia & Bereiter (1987) suggest that teachers hold disparate perspectives about writing instruction.

In this study teachers holding externally-focused and internally-focused perspectives were identified from a larger pool of teachers who participated in writing implementations focused on the process approach to teaching writing. Teachers with an externally-focused perspective expressed high agreement with the conception that the teacher informs students about form, and her/his role is to evaluate students according to decontextualized external criteria, e.g. mechanical rules. Teachers with an internally-focused perspective expressed high agreement with the conception that the student informs the teacher about the function of a written piece. That is, the teacher's role is to stimulate students to think of contextualized purposes so that they are able to reflect back on their paper, topic, social situations, audiences, and uses of form in order to evaluate the interaction between the written product and the reader. It is hypothesized that these perspectives represent differences in teacher conceptions about writing instruction, and that these conceptions are related to differences in instructional practice.

Method

Sample

The sample for this study can be described as a "purposive or judgemental" sample (Babbie, 1989) because teachers were selected for the purpose of studying disparate conceptions about teaching writing. To begin the selection process a pool of 27 third, fourth and fifth grade teachers who continued to teach process writing after participating in a writing implementation, completed a structured questionnaire. From the original pool, ten teachers were identified because they held the most disparate conceptions about writing instruction. These ten teachers who taught the same grade levels in the same urban midwestern school district were identified by their responses to a structured questionnaire examining teachers' conceptions about writing instruction. Five of the ten teachers are described as holding externally-focused conceptions about teaching writing because they agreed with propositional statements on the questionnaire indicating that they focused on the teacher's role in delivering information and evaluation that emphasized external standards and decontextualized criteria. The other five teachers are described as holding internally-focused conceptions about teaching writing because they agreed with statements indicating that they focused on student informancy and self-evaluation that emphasized internal standards and contextualized criteria. Because the ten teachers held the most disparate perspectives about writing instruction, their classrooms were selected for in-depth analysis.

Three of the teachers in each group participated in the Cognitive Strategies in Writing Project and two of the teachers in each group participated in the process writing inservice. All ten teachers had similar class sizes, years of experience, and students from the same population. They reported spending approximately the same amount of time each day and week teaching writing.

Materials

Teacher Questionnaire

Implementation teachers (N=27) completed a 36 item structured questionnaire on three conceptions about writing instruction. These conceptions were represented as propositional statements developed from the literature on teacher practices during process writing instruction (Tierney, Leys, and Rogers, 1984; Deford, 1984 and Raphael, Englert & Anderson, 1987) and from interview data reported and analyzed during a pilot study (Fear, Anderson, Englert & Raphael, 1986). The three subscales included conceptions about teacher's and student's roles as an informants, goals of writing instruction, and evaluation during writing instruction.(See Appendix A.)

Subscale one: Student informancy status. The first subscale reflects teacher thinking about the teacher and the student as informant in the classroom. A low score indicates that the teacher thinks that children receive decontextualized knowledge, while a high score on this subscale indicates that the teacher thinks that children use background knowledge to generate

and construct contextualized knowledge.

More specifically, a low score on this subscale suggests agreement with the items on this scale that were statements indicating agreement with the conception that writing instruction should involve students in thinking about externally-focused sources of information. Externally-focused sources of information include reproducing information in the form of text content, as well as reproducing decontextualized forms, rules and procedures described by the teacher. This conception is consistent with descriptions from research on classroom practice during writing instruction (Tierney et al., 1984; Deford, 1884; and Raphael et al., 1987) and with Bereiter and Scardamalia's description of the "low literacy tradition" in which the teacher is described as giving students assignments that she/he grades on the basis of the student's ability to reproduce content interpreted by the teacher. The teacher assumes informancy status by defining information and minimizing complexity so that students master and produce preconceived information.

A high score indicates agreement with the conceptions that writing instruction should involve students in thinking about internally-focused sources of information. An internal focus includes monitoring and using sources of information so that students choose and evaluate ideas, topics and information. According to this conception, the student is expected to relate old knowledge to new on their own initiative and they are encouraged to bring different kinds of knowledge to bear.

Teachers think about setting up tasks so that students recognize what is useful information by self-activating and reconsidering background knowledge. The student is thought of as an information resource, so that even when the teacher describes the situation or the audience the student is entrusted with the task of choosing appropriate information and making decisions about reader response. This conception is consistent with research on classroom practice and Bereiter and Scardamalia's description of the "high literacy tradition" or the "intentional" teaching model in which the teacher is described as "coaching" students to provide knowledge about problems that the student plans to solve.

Subscale two: Goals of writing instruction. The second subscale reflects conceptions about the goals of writing instruction as they affect the sequencing and choice of tasks for instruction. A low score indicates that the teacher thinks writing goals should emphasize mastery of a simple to complex sequence of decontextualized skills, while a high score on this subscale indicated that the teacher thinks writing goals depend on students' purposes and the social context both in school and out.

More specifically, a low score on this subscale suggests agreement with statements indicating agreement with the conception that writing instruction should involve students in thinking about externally-focused objectives. Externally-focused objectives include teaching decontextualized skills, formal text qualities, and motivating through extrinsic incentives. This conception is consistent with research on classroom practice and Bereiter and

Scardamalia's descriptions of the "exercise model" and the "knowledge-base" model that emphasize pre-prescribed goals such as spelling, punctuation, and mechanics.

A high score suggests agreement with statements indicating agreement with the conception that writing should involve students in thinking about internally-focused objectives which include choosing and analyzing contextualized purposes as well as audiences to communicate with. This is consistent with research on classroom practice and Bereiter and Scardamalia's description of the "high literacy tradition" or the "intentional" teaching model in which the teacher emphasizes the importance of "intrinsic sequentiality." In this model motivation is not applied by the teacher, but is one of the goals of instruction and therefore is part of the competence that is developed during writing instruction.

Subscale three: Evaluation. A low score on this subscale reflects the thinking that evaluation should be organized to facilitate teachers' presentation of decontextualized criteria, i.e., the teacher lays out a predetermined list of formal criteria used to evaluate written products. A high score on the third subscale reflects the conception that the student plays a major role in describing and using evaluation criteria for writing and that the teacher's role is to turn students' attention back on to written products in an effort to jointly understand functional problems with audience communication.

More specifically, a low score on this subscale indicates

agreement that writing instruction should involve students in thinking about externally-focused evaluation which includes applying formal decontextualized criteria. For example, the writer is encouraged to evaluate the quantity of descriptive words in a written piece, rather than the effect that descriptive words might have on the reader. This conception is consistent with research on classroom practice and Bereiter and Scardamalia's description of the teacher who grades workbooks and writing assignments on the basis of preset criteria.

A high score suggests agreement with statements indicating agreement that writing instruction should involve students in thinking about internally-focused evaluation which includes self-evaluation during each phase of the writing process. This is consistent with research on classroom practice and Bereiter and Scardamalia's description of the teacher who emphasized "self-regulatory procedures" in which students are involved in checking, planning, monitoring, testing and revising based on their perceptions of the reader's response.

The wording of the propositional statements on the questionnaire was taken from interview responses gathered during a pilot study (Fear, et al., 1986). The reliability of the questionnaire (.78) and the internal consistency of teachers' scores on all three conceptions ranging from .46 to .84 were computed using Cronbach's alpha.

Teacher Interview

A teacher interview was developed to further evaluate

teachers' conceptions about writing instruction. The one hour interview questions paralleled the three subscales on the teacher questionnaire. (See Appendix B.) The questions were selected from an interview developed for the Cognitive Strategies in Writing Project (Englert, et al., 1988). The interview and the observational data described next were rated on a five point scale that ranged from internally-focus to externally-focused.

Observational Data

An observational system which designated a framework for systematic data collection of information about student and teacher roles, status, goals, and evaluation was developed to examine teachers' practices in classroom writing instruction. (See Appendix C.) Data was collected over a four month period and analyzed to provide information about informancy status, sources of information, purposes for writing tasks, teacher's dialogue, evaluation of written pieces, responses to students and explicit explanations. The data consisted of classroom narratives that report teacher and student dialogue and classroom practice. These narratives were collected during approximately six one-hour writing lessons for each of the ten classrooms during the first half of the school year. The first three observations were conducted during the first three writing lessons and the remaining three observations were conducted one per month from October to December.

Procedures

Thirty-five teachers were recommended by the district

writing coordinator because they actively participated for one year in a district wide inservice or a writing research project. During the last month of the school year 27 teachers who continued to teach process writing after the implementation year completed the conceptions questionnaire. Teachers' scores were ranked along a continuum from externally-focused, to internally-focused based on responses to the questionnaire. Means and standard deviations of the teachers' scores on these two global constructs were calculated to check for significant variation. Then, ten teachers were selected from the opposite ends of the continuum. Four Mann Whitney tests were administered to determine that the two groups of five teachers differed significantly in their average scores on each of the three conceptions and their total scores on the conceptions questionnaire. During the next school year, observational data was collected from August to December and interviews were conducted in the spring after observational data were collected. Interview and observational data were rated a by two independent raters who supported the assigned rating by summarizing reasons and specifying examples from each interview and observation.

Results and Discussion

A brief summary of the major findings related to teacher differences on the questionnaire is followed by qualitative analyses of rater's summaries of interview responses and classroom observations. In section one, differences among the total 27 teachers' scores on the questionnaire are reported.

Specifically, differences between the two groups of the five teachers who held the most disparate conceptions on the teacher questionnaire, and the correlations generated between the questionnaire and the interview, and the questionnaire and the observations are examined. In section two, qualitative descriptions of differences in classroom practice and interview responses that parallel the differences found on the conceptions questionnaire are reported.

Section One

Differences in Teacher Conceptions Related to Practices

The results indicate that significant variation existed between the 27 teachers on the conceptions questionnaire when total scores ranging from -29 (externally-focused) to +28 (internally-focused) were examined. As can be seen from Tables 1 and 2, significant variation existed among teachers in their scores on the three conceptions about writing. Teachers differed in the degree to which their conceptions corresponded to an internally-focused and an externally-focused perspective. All three conceptions showed significant variation with neither a "ceiling" nor a "floor effect" in teachers' scores.

Table 3 contains the intercorrelations among teachers' scores ranging from .48 to .87. Consistent with the moderate to high intercorrelation found between conceptions, Table 3 indicates that teachers who scored high on a given conception also tended to score high on the other conceptions. In contrast, teachers who

scored low on a conception tended to score low on the other two conceptions.

In addition, significant differences were found between the two groups of the five externally-focused teachers' scores ranging from -29 to -10 and the five internally-focused teachers' scores ranging from +28 to +16 on all three conceptions and the total score. Specifically, the Mann-Whitney test revealed that statistically significant differences existed between the two groups of teachers' scores measuring conceptions about student informancy status ($W=15$, $p< .004$), goals of writing instruction ($W=16$, $p,< .008$), evaluation ($W=15$, $p<.004$) and on the total scores on the conceptions questionnaire ($W=15$, $p<.005$).

The significant differences found on the conceptions questionnaire are further supported by correlations generated between the questionnaire and observational and interview data. Interview data and observational data were independently rated and then separately correlated with questionnaire data. As shown in Table 4, the Spearman Rho nonparametric test indicated moderate to high correlations between the questionnaire and the interview for student as informant, goals, evaluation and the total score. In addition to these correlations, the moderate to high correlations between questionnaire scores and the observation ratings were also found to be statistically significant.

In sum, significant differences were found between two groups of teachers holding disparate conceptions about writing instruction. The teachers with an internally focus view the

student as an important agent in contextualizing instruction because they have knowledge and experience and therefore inform the teacher about the function or purpose of a written piece. This view is in sharp contrast to the view that the teacher decontextualizes instruction so that rules and standards concerning form are delivered to students without regard for contextualized audiences or purposes. Teachers consistently held either internal or external conceptions about student informancy status, goals and evaluation when observational and interview data were examined. The following section substantiates questionnaire findings by reporting interview responses and classroom observations related to each of the conceptions measured on the questionnaire.

Section Two

Descriptions of Differences in Teacher Practices

The following examples that describe differences between the internally-focused and externally-focused teachers' classroom practices were taken from summaries and examples noted by two independent raters who were blind to teacher and group identification. These examples describe similarities as well as differences in teacher practices that were used to support the rating designated on the rating scale.

Teacher conception: Student informancy status. During writing instruction both the internally-focused and the externally-focused teachers used prewriting activities to

stimulate children's background knowledge and they encouraged student to choose topics and to write for their classmates. However, analysis of interview and classroom observational data indicate that different teacher conceptions about informancy status drove the essence of these tasks.

The externally-focused teachers agreed with the view that the teacher holds informancy status and that her role is to inform students of decontextualized rules and principles about language conventions. A consistent pattern of events emerged across the first writing lessons of the school year in the five externally-focused teachers' classrooms. Externally-focused teachers attempted to reduce the complexity of the writing tasks so that students would know procedures to follow in order to help them begin to write for their classmates. Teachers spent the first writing lessons demonstrating how to write complete sentences, set up a paper with margins and indentations, and showing students which side of the paper the holes should face. When students generated ideas externally-focused teachers used student ideas as topics and gave students topic sentences demonstrating how to begin with a capital letter and how to structure a topic sentence. All five teachers gave minimum length requirements (e.g. number of lines or sentences or how much of the page to fill). Teachers focused on explaining correct procedures and they mentioned their "pet peeves" and what confused them when they checked students' papers.

In addition, during the first writing period teachers

gave students content ideas and directions about how to write for proximately 25-30 minutes as a whole group. Approximately 5-10 minutes were left for students to compose independently at the end of the lesson. Externally-focused teachers spent student composing time walking around the room encouraging and reminding students to follow directions concerning procedures covered earlier in the lesson. In addition, teacher interview comments suggest that teachers attempted to assist students by reducing the writing task to a set of procedures that were delivered to students. Teachers referred to their roles as "giving them (students) a blueprint to practice. . . so it is much easier", providing "the eight steps to writing a novel", taking students "step by step" through the writing process, "giving them a specific recipe", and "give them tools like POWER" (a mnemonic used to remember the steps in the writing process).

The internally-focused teachers, on the other hand, agreed with the view that students hold informancy status and they write for contextualized purposes. A consistent pattern of events also emerged across the first writing lesson of the school year in the five internally-focused teachers' classrooms. Teachers appeared to directly address the complexity of the writing task when they discussed issues, such as the difficulty of communicating thought, figuring out what you know and don't know, writing notes and plans to help yourself, thinking about getting help from "those who have more experience", and problems with "being an author" such as having ". . .too many ideas or too

few. "

In each of the internally-focused teachers first writing lessons a maximum of 6 minutes was spent on teacher directions followed by 25-35 minutes when students generated ideas and informed each other and the teacher of topics and ideas. During this time, teachers and the students thoughts were consistently related to the contexts that were immediate as well as distant. For example, when a dog walked into the classroom one teacher writes on the class topic list on the board "the dog who came to school." She talked about what she might say and write such as, "That dog won't hurt us, he's trying to find his person." She conjectors with the students, "I'm afraid to call the office because they might have to call the dog pound." Similarly, another internally-focused teacher used large name plates that students had designed earlier in the day in her first writing lesson. The name plate which featured students' interests embedded in the letters of their name were used to generate discussion and ideas for writing.

In all five classrooms students discussed related topics publicly after teachers made various comments concerning the importance of talking with others to help ". . . people who don't have an idea." Interview data gave further evidence that internally-focused teachers saw their students as important sources of information. Each of the five teachers explicitly stated that students learn from working with each other and three of the five stated that students get more and better ideas for

composing from each other rather than the teacher. One teacher states, "When someone has an idea it ignites a spark in somebody else so they get them (topics and ideas) from each other."

In sum, disparate conceptions about student informancy status were found to impact classroom practice. Even though both groups of teachers reported spending approximately the same amount of time on the initial phases of the writing process, differences in teacher conceptions about student informancy status affected the contents of the writing lesson. Externally-focused teachers talked to students about following procedures with the underlying message that writing would be easier and students would be better producers if they listen and follow a simple plan designated by the teacher. While internally-focused teachers talked about the complexity of the task that students would undertake as givers of information. This distinction between externally-focused and internally-focused conceptions about informancy status is consistent with finding reported by Lyons (1990) who found that teachers' perspectives toward themselves as knowers and students as knowers entered into classroom work and their development. Lyons (1990:173) cites Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1986) in describing "teacher's stance toward self as knower" versus "teacher's stance toward student as knower." Through analyses of teacher narratives, contrasting epistemological perspectives and the "concept of nested knowing" vs. the "image of silent knowers" are described:

> . . . a student or a teacher could be a dualistic knower, seeking or seeing one right answer; or hold a view of the multiplicity of knowledge, or the construction of all knowledge and of the individual as a constructs of knowledge all in different configuration, having different outcomes.

In addition, Lyons cites Barlett (1990) in describing how Carol Brent came to new ways of knowing through interaction with her students. This research extends the descriptions of the internally-focused teachers by describing a conception of learning in which teachers and students influences and are influenced by each other's ways of knowing across disciplines.

Teacher conception: Goals of writing instruction. Both the externally-focused and the internally-focused teachers stated that their primary goal was to teach students to value writing. However, even though both internally-focused and externally-focused teachers discussed personal meaningfulness, taught lessons on sentence structure and mechanics, and encouraged students to share pieces with their classmates, significant differences were found between the two groups of teachers conceptions about goals of writing instruction. The externally-focused teacher agreed with the view that the purpose of writing instruction is to teach language conventions and correct form so that the teacher should emphasize mastery of a simple to complex sequence of skills. Classroom observational data indicated that externally-focused teachers emphasized structural features first and then they discussed personal meaningfulness to motivate students to check mechanics after pieces were written. During the interview

externally-focused teachers stated that it was critical that students learn mechanics and that it was important for students to "practice, practice, practice". They described the importance of motivating through "gimmicks" or putting on performances, "being an actress". Two of the five teacher talked about holding back creative writing as a motivator for encouraging students to write more "factual" texts.

In contrast, internally-focused teachers agreed with statements on the conceptions questionnaire indicating that their goals are dependent on the situation and the contexts that students live within. Children's awareness of contextualized purposes provided the basis for instruction. For example, internally-focused teachers consistently signaled the blending of teacher purposes and student purposes when they discussed with students the reasons for using language conventions and mechanical rules to accomplish communication purposes designated by the student. A consistent pattern across all five interview indicated that internally-focused teachers thought about enabling students to be intentional. For example, all five teachers made similar comments stating that their goals were to ". . . just let them (students) know that there are stories in there" and ". . . helping them to find out what they can write," and "give them a chance to say what they want to say." One internally-focused teacher talked about using text structures and organization to help students ". . . say more completely what they want to say" and another stated that organizing helped students to be ". . .

skillful at entertaining the reader." One teacher stated that poor writers just needed to be taught that they "did have something to say."

In sum, disparate conceptions about goals were found to have significant impact on classroom practice. Even though both the internally-focused and the externally-focused teachers stated that their primary goal was to encourage student to value writing, differences in teachers conceptions about goals affected the essence of writing instruction. Externally-focused teachers talked about making writing easier by helping students to learn correct form so that students would desire to write more. Internally-focused teachers talked about students' incoming intentions and desires to communicate. Reasons for using correct form were explained as a means of enabling students to achieve their own communication purposes.

These distinctions between externally-focused and internally-focused conceptions about goals are consistent with findings reported by Lyons (1990). She describes teachers as either making goals explicit for students by focusing on proofs or rules, in contrasted with goals that emphasize the "logic of contextuality" as students and teachers together appreciate complexity and construct meaning within subject matter. Lyons cites Belensky et al., 1986, Barlett, 1990 and Bruner, 1985 in contrasting "procedural" or "separate knowers" vs. "connected" or "positional knowers." Similar to the internally-focused teachers, positional knowers are described as seeing truth as "situated" and

"partial" because it evolves from social contexts and relationships. Goals of instruction for positional knowers emphasize "a co-joint activity constructing meaning and potentially new knowledge." For example, Ramon Parks, a teacher in Lyons study similar to the internally-focused teachers, embraces rather than reduces complexity:

> The goal teachers seek in their practice is a widening of their own and their students' perspectives. (Lyons,1990:174)

Lyons contrasts teachers' perspectives about goals when she describes teachers who ". . .seek in their practice to render simplified and reduced categories for students to learn in a linear and orderly sequence." This is similar to the externally-focused teachers who stated that they sequenced lessons building from word level to sentence level to paragraph level. Interview data suggest that they organized instruction from a simple to complex sequence of skills in order to make writing easier so that students would desire to write more.

<u>Teacher conceptions: Evaluation vs. self-evaluation.</u> Although both internally-focused and externally-focused teachers talked with students about revising ideas, editing for mechanics, and publication of finished products for classmates, significant differences were found between the teachers' conceptions about evaluation. Externally-focused teachers agreed with the view that the teacher should evaluate student knowledge according to preconceived criteria that can be decontextualized. Classroom conversation in each of the five externally focused teachers

classrooms was dominated by many examples of teachers' evaluative comments about content and mechanics as opposed to responses to the student or the student's writing.

Interview data indicated that externally-focused teachers regularly corrected mechanics and they attributed students writing problems to a lack of motivation and effort. For example, one teacher who assigned steps for writing a novel (e.g. first, write about characters and then second write about a setting), felt that students were not motivated to follow step five because they did not want to continue to put forth effort. Interestingly, step five required that the students were to describe how one of the characters would find a job after arriving in the big city with little money. This teacher attributed low motivation to the number of pages that students had already written. No mention was made of the possibility that elementary students' may have a limited frame of reference or intention to complete the task required by step five. This teacher similar to other externally-focused teachers attributed problems to students lack of desire to write rather an absence of intentionality given the substance of the writing assignment. As such, externally-focused teachers evaluated student products on a preset list of criteria rather than evaluating the students' intent to communicate or the students' knowledge of how to communicate with an audience.

In contrast, internally-focused teachers who agreed with the view that students need to self-evaluate the meaning of their paper as it will be understood by an audience, immersed students

in tasks that necessitated student reflection about their classmates responses. Consequently, they evaluated students' intentionality and ability to think about how a reader might respond. Each of the five internally-focused teachers stated that they did not motivate students. Instead, they discussed that which is motivational to students such as reading and talking about past events or ". . . reading other children's writing from other times." In each case the internally-focused teachers assessed students' ability to think about authentic communication tasks that tapped intentions within their students.

Consistent with the internally-focused teachers contextual view of evaluation, student to student evaluation was valued and treated as part of the decision making process in their classrooms. For example, in one classroom students attached a response sheet at the end of their books for their classmates to record their written responses to student composed texts, and in three of the internally-focused teachers classrooms the whole class discussed students' work on overhead projection sheets as part of the composing process. Interview data and classroom data indicate that student responses were intended to make a differences in the students' thinking and in final written products. Students interacted about their written pieces while texts were being written rather than in one final oral reading session after publication. Furthermore, interaction over texts took the form of student to student responses while the teacher reminded the students that comments were to be taken as

suggestions rather than commands. The teacher often helped to frame problems generated by a student authors during class discussion. However, the internally-focused teachers consistently asked the author, "How can you solve it," rather than articulating a judgement about the quality of the problem confronted or the quality of the a written piece under consideration.

In sum, disparate conceptions about evaluation were found to impact classroom practice. Even though both groups of teachers used peer conferencing and provided opportunities for students to publish their writing, differences in teacher conceptions about evaluation affected the essence of writing instruction. The externally-focused teachers set up criteria ahead of time, attempted to motivate students to write and they evaluated students products. In contrast, internally-focused teachers responded to students as part of a class discussion about problems of communication. Similar to the teachers that Lyons describes, differences in teacher conceptions about "positionality" were found to influence teachers' conceptions about evaluation. That is, in Lyons research teachers were found to interpret and assesses students' stances toward knowing contexts and realities that are difficult to assimilate. As with the internally-focused writing teachers in the present study, evaluation became a continuous and dynamic process that evolved from the situation and the position of the student as apposed to a static event that focused on rules and proofs.

Conclusions and Implications

Disparate teacher conceptions were found to exist after teachers participated in writing reform intiatives over a two year period. Teachers were involved in and implemented the same extensive training in process writing. That is, both groups of teachers used the same implementation terminology to engage students in tasks such as brainstorming, topic selection, multiple draft writing, revising, editing and publishing for an audience. In addition, both the group of five internally-focused and the group of five externally-focused teachers stated that their primary goal was to encourage student to value and become more skillful at writing. However, the data indicate that disparate conceptions drove the essence of classroom practices. The externally-focused teachers attempted to increase students desire to write by reducing the complexity of writing tasks. They assisted students by isolating and simplifying procedures, criteria, and rules. They sequenced lessons according to their perceptions of the complexity of language conventions and then they encouraged students to use conventions and to think about decontextualized criteria such as including descriptive words. As such they focused on language forms rather than on the communicative function of language.

Internally-focused teachers, on the other hand, situated students in positions so that they began by asking students to communicate with audiences within students'social contexts. They directly identified the complexity of the task and gave students

control and the responsibility to respond to each other as informants, respondents and self-evaluators. When they discussed language conventions they discussed the function of the convention so that they focused on contextualized criteria such as determining how the language within the text assisted the reader.

Differences in teachers' internally and externally-focused conceptions are important to understand because these differences were found to be related to differences in student perceptions and performance. In analyses of student data collected simulaneously with this data, differences were found between students in the internally-focused and externally-focused teachers' classrooms after four months of instruction (Fear, 1989). The internally-focused teachers' students surpassed the externally-focused teachers' students when content and mechanics of written composition were examined. Compared to the externally-focused teachers' students, the internally-focused teachers' students thought more about writing as an internally driven activity that is completed to communicate with different audiences in different contexts.

One major implication of the findings concerns the important role that teacher conceptions play in conceptualizing a model of writing instruction. Teachers themselves may want to study their own conceptions about students goals and evaluation and how these conceptions impact writing instruction as well as their teaching strategies and materials. Professional development within the teaching of writing would then include involving

teachers in new ways of seeing and in being in relationships with learners and learning.

A second implication concerns the important role that teacher conceptions play in interpreting the training that they receive. That is, even though groups were balanced in terms of the content and amount of training in process writing, teachers held opposing views of writing instruction. Because teachers' conceptions were found to be highly correlated to conceptions inferred from interview data and from observational data of classroom practice, the results suggest that determining teachers' incoming conceptions about student informancy status, goals and evaluation might be necessary for understanding differences in teachers' interpretations of training and ultimately how that training will be applied to classroom practice. Consequently, this research is important for educational reformers, staff developers and for writing researches as they interpret past reform effects and plan future efforts focused on improving writing instruction in elementary. Lack of attention to teacher conceptions may result in conceptions that are not only disparate but counter to the conceptions intended by reform efforts. Therefore, it is important to assess rather than assume that congruence exists between teachers' conceptions and the conceptual frameworks that undergird intended writing reform. It is important that additional research examines how teachers interpret and enact writing curriculum and how students interpret writing instruction in order to improve instructional effectiveness.

References

Ball, D.L. (1988). Research on teaching mathematics: Making subject matter knowledge part of the equation. In J. Brophy (Ed.), Advances in research on teaching, (Vol. 2, pp. 103-135). Greenwich, CT:JAI Press.

Britton, J. (1975). The development of writing abilities. New York: Macmillan.

Cherryholmes, C.C. (1988). Power and criticism: Post-structural investigations in education. New York: Teachers College Press.

Deford, D.E. (1984). Classroom context for literacy learning. nI T.E. Raphael (Ed.), The contexts of school-based literacy (pp. 163-180). New York: Random House.

Duffy, G., & Roehler, L., Meloth, M., Vavrus, L., Book,C., Putnam, J., & Wesselman, R. (1986). The relationship between explicit verbal explanations during reading skill instruction and student awareness and achievement: a study of reading teacher effects, Reading Research Quarterly, 21 (3), 237-252.

Eagleton, T. (1983). Literary theory. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

Englert, C.S., Raphael, T.E., & Anderson, L.M., Anthony, H.A., Fear, K.L. & Gregg, S. (1986). Establishing a Case for Writing Instruction: The What and Why of Teaching Expository Writing. Occasional Paper 116, Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University.

Englert, C.S., Raphael, T.E., Fear, K.L. & Anderson, L.M. (1988). Students' metacognitive knowledge about writing informational text. Learning Disability Quarterly, 11 (1), 18-46.

Fear, K.L. (1990). The relationship between teacher conceptions and student perceptions and performance in writing. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Graves, D. (1983). Writing teachers and students at work. Exeter, New Hampshire: Heinemann.

Lyons, N. (1990). Dilemmas of knowing: Ethical and epistemological dimensions of teachers' work and development. Harvard Educational Review, 60 (2), 159-180.

McDiarmid, G.W., Ball, D., & Anderson,C. (in press). Why staying ahead one chapter just won't work: Subject-specific pedagogy. In Reynolds (Ed.) Knowledge base for beginning teachers. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges of Education.

Peterson, P.L., Fennema, E., Carpenter, T.P., & Loef, M., (1987). Teacher's pedagogical content beliefs in mathematics. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.

Raphael, T.E., Englert, C.S. & Anderson, L.M., (1987) What is effective instructional talk? Acomparison of two writing lessons. Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, St.Petersburg, Florida.

Scardamalia, M. & Bereiter, C. (1986). Research on written composition. In M.C.Wittrock (Ed.) Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 778-803). New York: MacMillan Publications.

Schwille, J., Porter, A., Floden, R., Freeman, D., Knapp, L., Kuhs, T., & Schmidt, W. (19883). Teachers as policy brokers in the content of elementary school mathematics. In L. Shulman and G. Sykes (Eds.) Handbook of teaching and policy. New York: Longman.

Shulman, L.S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. Educational Researcher, 15(2), 4-14.

Tierney, R.J., Leys, M. and Rogers, T. (1984). Comprehension, composition, and Collaboration: Analyses of communication influences in two classrooms. In T.E. Raphael (Ed.), The contexts of school-based literacy (pp. 191-216), New York: Random House.

Temple, C. A., Nathan, R.G. & Burris, N.A. (1982). The beginnings of writing. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Wilson, S.M. & Wineburg, S.S. (1987). Peering at history from different lenses: The role of disciplinary perspectives in the teaching of american history. Unpublished paper prepared for the Spencer Foundation, Standford University.

Table 1

Distribution of Scores on the Three Conceptions and the Total Score by Individual Teacher (N-27)

Teacher#	1.Informancy	2.Goals	3.Evaluation	4.Total
280	+6	+12	+10	+28
290	+11	+7	+6	+24
270	+11	+3	+5	+19
180	+4	+8	+5	+17
210	+6	+8	+2	+16
110	+7	+3	+5	+15
130	+1	+13	+1	+15
250	+3	+1	+8	+12
240	+3	+3	+5	+11
220	+2	+1	+5	+8
120	+2	+1	+4	+7
360	+4	+1	+1	+6
230	+5	+5	-4	+6
350	+1	0	+3	+4
140	+4	0	0	+4
300	+3	+3	-2	+4
170	+3	+1	-1	+3
320	-2	+3	+1	+2
310	+4	+2	-5	+1
160	-2	-2	+3	-1
330	-4	+2	0	-2
100	+5	-6	-2	-3
260	-6	+4	-8	-10
190	-6	-3	-2	-11
200	-10	-1	-4	-15
340	-13	-8	-6	-27
150	-8	-4	-17	-29

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Scores on Conceptions as Measured by the Writing Conceptions Questionnaire

All Teachers Conceptions		(N = 27)
1. Student as informant	Mean	1.26
	SD	5.91
2. Goals of writing instruction	Mean	2.11
	SD	4.80
3. Evaluation in writing instruction	Mean	.48
	SD	5.61
4. Total across all three conceptions	Mean	6.67
	SD	14.21

Table 3

Correlations Between Teachers' Scores on Subscale and the Global Constructs on the Writing Conceptions Questionnaire (N=27)

Conceptions	1	2	3	4
1. Student as informant	.80	.53	.63.	87
2. Goal of writing instruction	---	.53	.48	.64
3. Evaluation during writing instruction	---	---	.71	.80
4. Total score on all three conceptions	.87	.64	.80	.76

Table 4

Correlation Between Teachers' Scores on Conceptions Questionnaire and Teachers' Scores on the Conceptions Interview and Observation Ratings

Scores on Conception Questionnaire	Interview Rating	Observation Rating
1. Student as Informant	.79*	.78*
2. Goals	.65*	.70*
3. Evaluation	.85*	.76*
4. Total Score	.71*	.69*

APPENDIX A

Teacher Conceptions Questionnaire

The conceptions questionnaire is designed to assess teachers' conceptions about writing instruction. The questionnaire consists of 36 items designed to assess teachers' conceptions on three subscales. Items preceded by a "+" represent internally-focused propositions, while items preceded by a "-" represent externally-focused.

I. Student as informant.

+(Children have background knowledge and they construct their own knowledge.)

-(Children receive knowledge and need to be given information.)

+12. Children learn how to write best by figuring out for themselves the ways to find answers to writing problems.

+25. Children can figure out ways to write papers without formal instruction.

+26. Experience forms the basis for a good writer.

+39. Sometimes when students get started they might write three of four different things.

+42. Good writers have lots of questions about where to get information.

+43. Most children can figure out a way to solve many writing problems without adult help.

-2. It is important that students know how to follow directions to be good writers.

-4. Children learn best by attending to the teacher's explanation.

-10. Good writers think systematically and usually have good mechanical skills.

-13. When children have problems writing its usually because they have language problems or problems with reasoning or apoor grasp of the english language.

-17. It is important for a child to be a good listener in order to learn how to write.

-23. When students get stuck while writing I usually try to give them ideas so that they might get their thinking startedagain.

II. The goals of writing instruction.

+(Children's awareness of forms and contextualized functions together should provide the basis for instruction.)

-(Decontextualized forms and language conventions should provide the basis for instruction.)

+8. My writing goals depend on the situations, the lesson and the mood of the students.

+9. Students can use ideas from cartoons and t.v. programs as ideas for writing.

+11. When selecting the next topic to be taught, a significant consideration is what children already know.

+14. I write the same kinds of papers that my students do.

+28. Students write in my classroom in order to teach other students.

+33. My overall goals for teaching writing change depending on the subject that I am teaching.

-5. Time should be spent learning the love and value of writing before children spend much time composing.

-19. It is important to break down a sequence of mechanical skills when planning for instruction.

-22. When selecting the types of writing lessons to be taught one must consider the logical organization of skills.

-29. I assess students understanding by giving them writing assignments.

-36. When selecting the next topic to be taught, one must consider the logical organization of mechanical skills.

-44. No matter what subject that students are writing in they should be taught to use proper spelling and punctuation because people judge their writing.

III . Evaluation within writing instruction.

+ (Writing instruction should be taught in relation to understanding the role of self-critcism and self-evaluation of meaning as communicated to an audience)

- (Teachers should evaluate knowledge according to preconceived criteria that does not consider the audience and purpose of the writer.)

+15. Students should pretend that they are a friend or a neighbor when they go back over their work.

+ 20. When students are confused by their own writing I ask them to tell me what the problem is.

+24. Good writers have lots of questions.

+31. When a student gets writers block, I ask them where they want to go with their ideas.

+38. Teachers should encourage children who are having difficulty solving a writing problem to continue to try to find solutions.

+48. Teachers should allow children to figure out their own ways to solve writing problems.

-7. When students are finished writing a draft, they should then go back and check for spelling and grammatical errors.

-16. Students should be encouraged to use descriptive words in their written pieces.

-18. I seldom have students working with their peers because they have trouble giving each other specific feedback.

-34. Teachers should evaluate student writing to be sure that the lessons goals have been accomplished.

-45. Good writers remember to use the set of criteria that I lay out in class beforehand.

-46. Good writers ask questions like: Do you think this paper is ready to be handed in?

APPENDIX B

Teacher Interview

The interview will follow a structured format. The interviewer will ask questions as written below and then the teacher's answers will be followed with probes when necessary. All teachers' responses to the interview will be audiotaped and later transcribed. Interview questions and procedures include the following (adapted from CSIW interview, Englert et al., 1988).

TEACHER INTERVIEW

(General information to see what surfaces first.)

1. In the first section of this interview I would like to deal with general ideas and perceptions about writing in your own class. The first thing I want to know is, when do students write?

2. Could you give me an example of what a typical writing activity looks like during reading, language, social studies or science? Do you formally teach writing during the day? When? (Goals, Conception II)

3. What are the goals of your writing program? In June when you look back over the year, what are the things in general that you would want your students to leave your room with as a result of your writing program?

4. Now I'd like to move away from general goals to specific things that you think your kids should learn by the end of the year. What are specific things that you want your students to leave your room with as a result of your writing program?

5. Are there any skills that you would hope that your students would walk away with?

6. How do you begin a lesson or a unit that would include writing a paper?

7. Where do your students get their specific topics?

8. What do your students write reports about? In contrast to creative writing, what are some kinds of informational topics that your students have written about?

9. Where do students get information for there reports? What kinds of things might you do?

(Evaluation, Conception III)

10. When your students are writing their papers do you see them making changes in their paper as they're writing? What kinds of revisions do they make?

11. If you had to identify the major problem that you think your students have in writing reports, what would you say that problem is?

12. Do you evaluate your students reports? How?

13. zhat do you do to motivate kids for different kinds of writing assignments?

(Informancy, Conception I)

14. How would you characterize a good writer What makes somebody a good writer? What do you think children need to learn to be a good writer?

15. How would you characterize a poor writer? What makes somebody a poor writer?

16. Children often ask questions in class as they work on their papers. What sorts of questions do children ask when they are writing? What kinds of questions are good or poor?

17. Have you noticed any kinds of students that are more dependent or more independent than other students?

18. Do you have any techniques that you use to help promote children's independence in writing?

(Specific application questions-these could cover any or all of the conceptions.)

21. Now I'm going to describe two students for you to describe what kind of help you might give that student. Sam is a student who has a lot of trouble just selecting a topic, coming up with ideas and getting ideas organized. What would you do to help him with these problems? Let's say that Sam is about to turn a paper in to you. What are some things that you might say to him when he is finished before he hands his paper in?

22. Let's say that Rosa is another student. Rosa can come up with ideas, she's written an explanation. What are some things you might say to her? (show a series of written pieces)

23. Do you think it would be helpful to have her work with a peer?

24. What do you think the role of the teacher should be in teaching writing ? What do you think the teacher's responsibility should be?

25. What do you think the role of the learner should be in the writing lesson? What do you think the student's responsibility should be?

Note to the Interviewer: Throughout the interview, if you think the teacher has already answered a question then say, "The next question is:. . . I think that you already answered that question. Do you think that you answered it? Is there anything else that you want to add?"

APPENDIX C

Guidelines for Observations

GENERAL PROCEDURES:

Written notes on complete writing lessons should be taken in addition to audio-recorded lesson content. In general, the observer should write down the teacher's dialogue in addition to keeping a running log of the teacher's activity and how the student's are responding. Time should be noted regularly every 3-5 minutes.

The overall tone or ethos in the room should be noted (e.g., orderly, disorderly, relaxed but businesslike or disciplined vs. confusing, student self-regulated vs. teacher dominated.)

HYPOTHESIS OF THE STUDY

The major hypothesis of the study is that what teachers think, say and do with students during writing instruction affects student thinking in terms of student voice, internal vs. external control, andconceptions about writing.

More specifically, teacher differences in ways of thinking about form and function will affect the way that they think about the role of the student and the teacher, their writing goals, topic selection and evaluation. Therefore, the tasks that they assign and the dialogue that they use in the classroom may reflect these differences in conceptions. The next section will describe how you might see difference in teacher conceptions operating in the classroom.

1. Role of the student as informant. Students are informants that use forms such as text structures, punctuation, grammar etc. for a purpose that they own. The student is responsible for teaching or informing his/her chosen audience. Therefore, the teacher's role is to communicate this role to the student through dialogue. The teacher informs the student of conventional forms and reasons for using forms that will help the student to solve problems and facilitate communication of the student's ideas to a "real world" audience.

Topic selection then becomes the responsibility of the student. The teacher's role is to provide instruction that models thinking about how to arrive at a topic rather than suggesting topics or assigning topics. I am interested in how teachers set up and introduce a writing lesson as well as how they follow through during the writing lesson or lessons in facilitating students purposes during editing and revision. How are tasks and problems negotiated?

2. Goals of the writing program I am interested in describing what goals are explained to students and how goals are communicated to students (e.g. explicit or implicit). Are goals adjusted to combine the purposes that students bring and the knowledge of forms that teachers bring, given the specific social context of the classroom?...or...Are the goals stable and decontextualized.

   Does the teacher communicate to the student that forms or language conventions are used to fulfill real functions rather than contrived or routine school tasks that have no real audience communication or purpose besides the teacher assessment of decontextualized skills.

   The teacher mediates this process by questioning student's purposes, helping them to define goals and problems. How does the teacher incorporate her agenda and the students agenda intersubjectively.

3. Evaluation

   Teachers response to students and self-criticism. How does the teacher respond to students written pieces? Who responds to whom? How and when does the response take place? (e.g. oral response with the student vs. written response without the student present). Does the teacher tell the student how she would change the piece, or does she ask the student to think about how the intended audience might react? Does the teacher help the student to think about the audience if the audience is distant?

   Does the student communicate at the beginning of the lesson what will be evaluated or how evaluation will take place? Does the teacher communicate at the beginning of the lesson that writing is to be evaluated by the teacher so that writing assignments

are for assessment vs. learning. Is writing used by the teachers to evaluate if students know appropriate forms vs. if the student has voice and ownership of their pieces. Does the teacher care if the piece says something to an audience rather than fulfilling a duty for the teacher?

What does the teacher evaluate (e.g. text structure, descriptive words, mechanics, voice, reader sensitivity, considerateness of text, student self-evaluation of their text)?

Is the evaluation task set up so that more than one person responds to a written piece? Does the teacher evaluate if the student knows "why" forms are important?

SPECIFIC GUIDELINES: Be sure to note:

1. Instructional times: keep a running record of the amount of time spent on explanation of form and function, as well as response, selection of topics, and evaluation.

2. Individual work and conference times: try to capture teachers individual dialogue with students and kinds of comments that students make to each other.

3. Types of dialogue: Does the teacher "ask" or "tell"? How often does the teacher respond to students? What is the pattern of asking and telling?

4. Keep a running record of non-verbal interactions. How does the teacher position herself in relation to her students (e.g., does she sit next to students, stand over students)? Are there signs of the teacher's attitude toward pupils and their roles...pupil movement around the room? (e.g., Can students get up and ask questions of each other? Can students sit under tables or choose places to write?)

THINGS TO LOOK FOR:

Organize your notes according to the natural flow of conversation and events. Here are some specific things to look for:

1. Does the teachers dialogue move back and forth from ideas about form to ideas about function?

2. Are there causal links in here talk with students?

3. What are the purposes set for writing, (e.g., for a school-tasks or for real world tasks)? Does the teacher talk about her own real purposes and then engage students in thoughts of their own purposes? Does the teacher critique her own work?

4. Does the teacher model how she thinks about forms and functions given her own real world experiences?

5. Does the dialogue transfer control of ideas and purposes? Does the teacher listen to the students purposes and ask questions that focus on that purpose?

6. Does the teacher give examples of "why" things are done and "how" decisions are made about the tasks and other classroom concerns?

7. Does the teacher talk about how she figured out what audience she would be talking to and why?

8. Are expectations communicated that the written piece should be completed in one class session? Does she explain why certain time limits or guidelines are given? Are students allowed to choose times to finish?

9. Where do written products go?

10. Is the criteria for evaluation made explicit? If so when? When does the teacher respond to a written piece?

11. Does the teacher set requirement unrelated to purpose and audience (e.g., write 5 lines)?

12. Do students respond to each others writing? When and how often?

13. Does the teacher have students plan, organize, draft, revise and edit? Is she concerned with evaluating the process or just getting an answer?

14. Are clarity and coherence and considerateness of the text ever mentioned?

15. Are students asked to evaluate other contextual variables that might effect how the written piece will be received (e.g., Where will your reader be sitting when he/she read this)?

16. What instructional strategies does the teacher use? Does the teacher gives procedures to follow or does she give problems to solve?

17. Does the teacher communicate that students can solve problems and that they know valuable information or that they can find valuable sources of information? Do expectations vary by student?

APPENDIX D

Rating Scale for the Teacher Interview and Observational Data

Subscale One: Student as Informant

(Contextualized View vs. Decontextextualized View)

Teacher wants to hear from students . . . versus. . . teacher wants only to tell students things they don't know.

The first subscale reflects teacher thinking about the student as an informant in the classroom. A high score on this subcale indicates that the teacher thinks that children use background knowledge to generate and construct knowledge. This is a contextualized view of writing instruction because the teacher sees the student as knowing a great deal of information that she can use to 1) learn from and about students and 2) connect the information that she wants students to learn form her.

A low score reflects the thinking that children receive knowledge. The teacher needs to inform the student of topics, information, rules and procedures for writing a paper. This is a decontextualized view because the teacher doesn't see the students incoming knowledge and experience as important for instruction. Instead, she needs to inform students. For example, during planning the teacher gives students topics or during editing the teacher by tells students to indent, use capitals or write incomplet sentences. She thinks more about the deficits in students thinking rather than the assets. For example, when this teacher talks about the importance of writing complete sentences, you get the sense that you use correct form because you are a better writer if you use correct form rather than you communicate to a reader your message more effectively if you use correct form. The teacher might talk about readers or audience but she thinks about the student as producers of correct form rather than givers of information.

Several examples of teacher statements about students ability to inform about content or process. Students choose topics and get ideas for writing from their experiences or peers. Teacher asks the students to think of ideas. She generates ideas with students. She invites students to give each other ideas by writing them on an overhead, the chalkboard or involving students in oral discussion or groups discussions. Teacher might assign an

audience during planning, but students choose what they know about to tell this audience while brainstorming or drafting. The emphasis is on giving ideas that you have in your head rather than the teacher selection of information. The students spend most of the writing time informing others about topics and ideas that they know about. The teacher asks students what they <u>think about</u>.

The teacher views students as able to inform her and each other about content, process and attitudes. For example, students are seen as having knowledge about topics and planning as well as about drafting and editing so that the teacher believes that peer editing has value. Although the teacher may feel there are some problems with peers working together, she can see the value of having students work together. This is beyond one or two "high" students who act as teachers aids. The teacher thinks that students learn more about the writing process from working together.

5 In addition, the teacher might express the conception that students can inform each other of content so that she might metnion publishing students work. Again this isn't publishing for publishings sake, the teacher talks about readers and writers so that you get the sense that she hopes publishing is a means of sharing thought. The teacher may talk about the improtance of using correct form, such as punctuation, complete sentences and spelling, but form and sense making are seen as related to each other so that they are connected during instruction.

4 A few examples of teacher statements about student as knowing and important sources of infomation. The teacher rated 4 has the same conceptions about her students as the teacher above in rating 5, but there are fewer examples and the pattern of her thinking is less clear.

3 The teacher and the student both mention some ideas, but it's hard to tell who chooses topics and who has iformation to share about content or process.

2 The teacher rated 2 has the same conceptions about her students as the teacher below in rating 1, but there are fewer examples and the pattern of her thinking is less clear.

1 Several examples of statements that indicate that the teacher needs to tell students topics and information to write about as well as information about the correct form of the paper. The topic may be a secondary concern to the teacher because teacher is stresses how to set up the paper and physical features rather than being concerned about paper contents. Teacher spends most of the time telling students what to write and <u>what to do</u> rather <u>thinking about</u> what ideas they want to express. She doesn't talk

about the student as having ideas that they can share, she talks more about the importance of making sure that students can write information in a way that she needs to inform them about.

Subscale 2: Goals of Writing Instruction

The second subscale reflects teacher thinking about the goals of writing instruction. A high score indicates that the teacher thinks writing goals are dependent on the students' purposes and social contexts both in and out of school. She focuses on the importance of students intentions during writing instruction. She doesn't see the need to impose motivation because if students see writing as purposeful then she does need to be the primary source of motivation.

A low score indicates that the teacher thinks writing goals should emphasize the intentions that she holds for students, such as her intent that students should master correct forms that can be removed from students purposes. She expresses the need to motivate students through instruction or in other words she sees motivation as part of the instruction that she needs to provide rather than motivation as coming from students or the writers' intentions.

5 Several examples of students purposes and goals. Teacher emphasizes students need to think about purpose, audience and intentional control of writing. Statements indicate that the students' goal is to communicate meaning to a reader or an audience of classmates or an audience in the students' social context. The teacher encourages students to think about planning and organizing for a reader and mentions publication as one way to help students set goals for writing. Teachers talk and assignments emphasize the importance of instilling the notion that student are author so that she doesn't need to do all external motivating. Her goal is to get students to desire to write and see purpose. They need to own the purpose for communicating ideas and own the purpose for using correct mechanics. When this this teacher talks about mechanics you get the sense that students need to understand the reasons for using correct form. She not only states that her goal is that students will desire or appreciate writing. She also talks about the students need to learn to choose purposes or audiences and topics. In this talk learning mechanics is seen by students as important to achieve a communication purpose.

4 The teacher rated 4 has the same conceptions about her goals as the teacher above in rating 5, but there are fewer examples and the pattern of her thinking is less clear.

3 Teacher mixes equally comments about contextualized purposes and content and decontextualized form. It's hard to tell what she emphasizes because both are talked about and are equally emphasized.

2 The teacher rated 2 has the same conceptions about her students as the teacher below in rating 1, but there are fewer examples and the pattern of her thinking is less clear.

1 Several examples of teacher emphasis on her purpose or intentions which are often express as her goal is that student will master correct mechanics and decontextualized forms. The teacher might state that her goal is to have students desire to write, but she does not teach students to set goals or purposes. Instead, she believes that if students learn correct form they will be better writers so then they will desire to write. The teacher doesn't address students incoming intentions or desire to communicate, she sets purposes by defining what better writers do. Therefore, the teacher stresses the importance of indenting, capital letters, punctuation, margins on the sides of the paper as means to becoming a better writer. She imposes upon students her desire to have them become better writers that produce correct form, rather than using students intentions to help them learn to use form to achieve the goals that they have set.

Subscale 3: Evaluation

The third subscale reflects the teacher's thinking about evaluation. A high score on this subscale reflects the thinking that students play a role in thinking about and evaluating their own topics, ideas and written pieces. The teachers' role is to turn student's attention back on to written pieces in an effort to jointly understand problems about audience and communication. A low score on this subscale reflects the thinking that teachers role is to evaluate topics and written products using decontextualized criteria such as emphasizing the use of mechanics, descriptive words, or formatting the paper.

5 Several instances where the teacher encourages the students to think about their reader. The teacher helps students to reflect on what they want to accomplish and how they will effectively communicate to a reader. Teacher talks about being organized or interesting for a reader so that they can understand or learn from your written pieces. The teacher talks and sets of tasks with the assumption that audiences will read your writing so student needs to check to make sure the writing makes sense. Evaluative comments do not dominate teacher talk.

4 A few instances of 5 above, again a less clear pattern.

3 Mixed teacher evaluates and student evaluates.

2 A few instances of 1 below, again a less clear pattern.

1 Several instances that teacher evaluates students comments and writing. The teacher implies or directly states that she will be looking for correct form (e.g., capital letters, indenting and surface features.) If teacher talks about an audience she imples or states that others will judge your writing rather than learn from it. Teacher talks and sets up tasks with the notion that she will assess students writing. Evaluative comments seem to dominate the teacher's talk.